

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 4-6, 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,516 B1 to Ishikawa et al. (“Ishikawa”).

As to claim 4, Ishikawa does not teach or suggest “[a] computer system, comprising ... a power controller ... *to determine whether the new total power requirement exceeds the known power capacity, and responsive to the new total power requirement exceeding the known power capacity to cause said power supply to continue to provide the total power requirement of said plurality of computers and to provide only standby power to said additional computer.*”

In Ishikawa, at Col. 11, line 55 to Col. 12, lines 24 does not discuss at all, the exceeding of the known power capacity. Ishikawa states that it “...decides the power consumption modes for all of the devices in the device group 2, which includes this device, based upon the requested current value and the value of the alternating current presently being supplied.” (Col. 11, lines 64-67; emphasis supplied). Since such a determination of exceeding of the known power capacity is not made in Ishikawa, it cannot be said that responsive to exceeding the power requirement, to cause the power supply to continue to provide the total power requirement of said plurality of computers and to provide only standby power to said additional computer is disclosed in Ishikawa as recited in claim 4.

Likewise, claim 11 recites “*if the power available is less than the new total power requirement, continuing to provide the total power requirement of the plurality of computers and providing only standby power to the additional computer.*” Claim 14 recites, “*determining the new total power requirement; and if the power available is less than the new total power*

Serial No. 09/893,981
Amendment dated March 15, 2006
Office Action dated September 15, 2006

requirement, continuing to provide the total power requirement of the plurality of computers and providing only standby power to the additional computer.” Though the Office Action relies on Col. 11, line 55 to Col. 12, line 24 of Ishikawa to show this feature, there is no disclosure in this section of determining if the power available is less than the new total power requirement as recited in these claims.

Since features of each of the pending claims are not taught or suggested by the cited references, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-6, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 15, 2006

By: 
Shawn W. O'Dowd
(Reg. No. 34,687)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street NW
Suite 700
Washington DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201
628918